

The Times Dispatch
Business Office: 115 N. Main Street
South Richmond: 100 N. Main Street
Lynchburg Bureau: 109 N. Sycamore Street
Petersburg Bureau: 215 Eighth Street
BY MAIL: POSTAGE PAID One Six Three One
Year: \$10.00 Six Months: \$5.00
Daily without Sunday: 10c
Sunday edition only: 10c
Weekly (Wednesday): 10c
Entered January 27, 1906, at Richmond, Va., as second-class matter under act of Congress of March 3, 1879.
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1911.
UP TO THE ALDERMEN.

Twenty-four representatives will tonight say whether the 130,000 people of Richmond shall have a better, a cheaper, a more effective form of city government. The interest and the hope of a great city are focused upon the Board of Aldermen to-night, for it will take but thirteen votes to rid Richmond of the domination of irresponsible domination. Thirteen men have an opportunity for writing their names higher as citizens who served their city than any Councilmen have had for half a century; a straight vote of "aye" on the ordinance as it comes from the Common Council to-night will entitle the Aldermen who cast it to the grateful consideration of the people more than anything else he could do in twenty years of service in the Council.

The Aldermen are not called upon to decide whether the new plan provides a system of government that is absolutely ideal, but whether it is not a vast improvement over the existing system, whether it will not protect their own rights and foster the city's welfare a thousand times better than does the present system.

A poll of the Board of Aldermen makes it clear beyond all doubt that a majority favor the four-ward plan of redistricting the city. That measure will come up first, and it should be passed speedily.

On the question of an administrative board, there is division as to detail, but a majority agree that there should be an administrative board of some sort. There are two propositions as to the jurisdiction of the administrative board, but in the debate and action on the whole plan to-night, those who are in favor of an administrative board must be careful not to get tangled up and vote down all propositions for an administrative board. There is the whole danger—that by getting mixed up on some of the amendments that will be offered, the Aldermen will defeat the very thing they want.

The Times-Dispatch is convinced that the people desire that the Board of Aldermen pass the ordinance to-night without allowing any amendment. Such action would clinch the whole proposition, and the ordinance would not have to be jockeyed back and forth between the two bodies. There is no telling what may happen to the ordinance if it should be sent back amended to the Common Council, for much confusion exists in that body with reference to plan. There are possibilities that the whole plan will be killed if the Board of Aldermen amends the ordinance to-night and sends it back to the Common Council. Let the issue be clear: those who vote "aye" on amendments to-night are voting to delay, if not destroy, the whole plan. There can be no shirking of responsibility by putting the matter back into the hands of the Common Council—the people will not hold that Aldermen blameless who vote for amendments, and the people will know who voted right and who voted wrong to-night. As a rule the citizens of Richmond take little interest in what their agents at the City Hall do, but in this matter they are vitally and generally interested, and they know that the man who votes wrong to-night is the man who will be voted out next spring.

Every man who believes in honest, efficient government is for the plan as it stands unamended; the Chamber of Commerce, the Business Men's Club and the Retail Merchants' Association back it as it stands; the tax-payers are one man are behind it, and what is most important of all, the citizens generally are backing the plan. The great body of thinking men in Richmond, the silent vote, have made up their minds that the unamended ordinance is what they want.

Here is a plan which goes right to the root of the evils we have in our city government. It places the government squarely in the hands of the people. It puts the people above the politician, and supplants the special interests of the ward boss with the common interests of all Richmond.

It is squarely up to you, gentlemen of the Board of Aldermen. You cannot dodge the issue. Your duty is plain. Do it. If you side with the opposition, you side with an opposition that has been dark and silent, not fighting in the open, but crawling around in the night.

Strike for Richmond's good and your own to-night. Vote for the plan unamended. Keep your heads. Remember that the eyes of the people are upon you. Give Richmond to-night what it ought to have had ten years ago. Vote for progress, for economy, for good government.

In everything but its form of municipal government Richmond is progressive.

Like the dog that caught the train, California does not know what to do with its direct legislation. How great the burden of direct legislation has been upon the voters and how slight the good it has accomplished are emphasized in a letter from Palo Alto, Cal., to the New York Evening Post. The writer of this letter, H. L. Smith, states that in November, 1910, the people adopted eight amendments to the Constitution of California, aggregating about four thousand words. Eleven months later, in October, 1911, they voted on twenty-three amendments to the same Constitution, aggregating about fifteen thousand words. Now, the Constitution, which had been passed in 1879 was a very voluminous and explicit document, requiring some twenty-two thousand words in all to set forth the organic law of California, yet the Federal Constitution of the United States only amounts, without amendments, to four thousand words. That is, California, in two elections and by thirty amendments, amended a Constitution five times as long as the Constitution of the United States by matter that was nearly five times as long.

One of the amendments, as Mr. Smith points out, which has just been adopted, contains three thousand six hundred words, and three of them above two thousand. Some of the subjects passed upon were the initiative, the referendum, the recall of judges, woman suffrage, and a compulsory recess of thirty days for the Legislature after the bulk of bills have been introduced. The result of this wholesale amendment has been to so alter the fundamental structure of the State that no one can say whether the existing laws really represent the will of the intelligent voters.

Nor is it difficult to see why this is so, since four hundred thousand electors can hardly digest the true intent and meaning of a broadside 3825 inches in size, sent out by the Secretary of State. Along with this went a supplemental sheet 95x12 1/2 inches, and these two papers contain the proposed amendments and the arguments for and against them. The sheets were densely printed, and nothing but the most earnest and intelligent patriot had either the sense or the courage to attack that mass of crowded letters and figures.

No one, according to Mr. Smith, has yet been found who even claims to have read the whole sheet.

Now, what was the result of this vast burden imposed upon the electors? Did the people rejoice in the freedom of the referendum? Was the intelligence of the public emphasized, and were the laws of California materially improved? The figures that Mr. Smith gives in answer to these questions are illuminative.

"The total vote for Governor in November, 1910, when the first eight amendments were adopted," says Mr. Smith, "was 335,713. The vote at the recent election ranges from 216,437 down to 193,773, say, from 61 per cent. to 50 per cent. of the gubernatorial vote in the preceding November. Only the interest in the suffrage movement kept the vote as high as it was. Even so, 50 per cent. of the people pushed a volume of legislation on such topics, besides the ones already mentioned, as weights and measures, eminent domain, legal procedure, compensation for accident, civil service, changes in school text books, elections, railway passes, clerks of courts. The woman suffrage amendment was carried by less than 1 1/2 per cent. of the less than 61 per cent. of the electorate who voted on it. With the exception of non-contentious amendments, the largest vote, 77 per cent. of the whole cast on it, was given to the provision for the recall of all elective officers, which includes judges.

On the other hand, an amendment which Mr. Smith characterizes as vicious, authorizing members of the railroad commission, and all peace officers, to accept railroad passes, was defeated by six thousand in a vote of two hundred and six thousand, and yet this piece of legislation was denounced by the entire press and by the intelligent opinion of the State.

The referendum may tend to re-establish popular government where it has been destroyed by a corrupt alliance between politicians and moneyed interests, but the experience of California does not encourage the belief that the restoration will be especially intelligent, effective or helpful.

RIDING TO A FALL.

Evidences multiply that through the "triumph" of the Liberal government and its following in curtailing the power of the House of Lords, with a view to vesting all legislative power in the Commons and reducing legislation virtually to a unicameral system, Great Britain has "swapped the devil for a witch" and the British people are awakening to a realization of the fact. Moreover, this realization indicates very clearly that the "reform" of the Lords consequent upon the passage of the parliamentary bill is likely to prove in the very near future a boomerang to the Liberal party.

A discontent that is gradually weakening and undermining the ministry is manifest in significant signs, and presents, no less in the ranks of the party

Itself than in those of the opposition. This is especially observable with reference to Lloyd-George's insurance bill, as to the principle of which both sides concur, but some of the details of which are criticized and denounced by both sides as immature, radical and vicious.

The truth is that the old veto prerogative of the upper chamber, which was abrogated by the passage of Mr. Asquith's parliamentary measure, was rarely, if ever, exercised arbitrarily or tyrannically. It was, at the last, only a "suspensive veto" power, for the Lords, have seldom, if ever, failed to yield, if on appeal to the country the sober second thought of the people demonstrated that any important measure the peers had thrown out was desired by the electorate. The intervention of this check to hasty, ill-considered, demagogic and revolutionary legislation on the part of the Commons has before now prevented just such crude and objectionable projects as the present denounced insurance bill from being fastened by law upon the masses. It has given the voters time to think, intelligent reaction of public sentiment time to assert itself.

Now, in lieu of the suspensive veto and the safeguarding conditions cited, the people find themselves under a supreme ministry which in turn is subject to the dictation of a triumvirate composed of Messrs. Asquith, Lloyd-George and Churchill. These can control legislation absolutely so long as Asquith's coalition sticks together and to him.

But how long will the British people stand the exchange of King Log for King Stork. Wait with the realization we have mentioned, the awakening that is going on, and the symptoms of irremediable dissolution, the outlook is not far ahead. The haste Mr. Asquith, through his lieutenants, is making to push through certain legislation, that is in the nature of paying his debts to his auxiliaries, shows that the government recognizes that the situation is critical and that its prestige is waning. Unless, therefore, the premier can create some new issue that will impart renewed cohesiveness to the several elements constituting his majority, there appears little, if any, question that his parliamentary bill triumph is in a fair way to eventuate in a Cadmean victory, or worse, for his party are many months have rolled away.

Events foreshadow that the ministry is riding to a fall at a ditch of its own digging.

PRESIDENT WHITTET'S RULING.

Although Alderman Robert Whittet, Jr., president of the Board, has as yet made no definite statement as to how he will vote on the ordinance for the administrative board, he has declared how he will rule on the number of votes necessary to pass this measure.

Parliamentary procedure is a two-edged sword that often wounds its wielder, and the amendment limiting the amount of money that the city might spend in carrying out the efforts to better the city government, so far from being a help to those who sought delay, has actually furthered the cause of the supporters of simplified government.

Doubtless the astute patriots who hit upon this amendment were satisfied that they had secured a means that would compel the impossible affirmative vote. But the ruling of President Peters, of the Common Council, supplemented by the opinion of City Attorney Pollard, shows what a rope of sand this hope was, and now President Whittet, of the Board of Aldermen, has declared that he will follow the same interpretation.

Evidently, the enemies of better government for Richmond will have to adopt some stronger tactics in the Board than those that proved so futile in the Common Council. And the members of the Board cannot blink the fact that fourteen hundred names have been added to the poll list so far this year. That increase is the strongest and most convincing proof that could be offered of public interest in the good government measure. An awakened and interested body of voters is the surest defense that any city can have against bad government. For such voters will administer good government well, and will not tolerate bad government in any form.

The Times-Dispatch confidently expects the Board of Aldermen to follow the Common Council and to meet the wishes of the people of Richmond by enacting the measure for simplified government and an administrative board just as it came from the lower branch.

WHAT TO CALL ONE'S WIFE.

A woman has written a letter to the Baltimore Sun, in which she gives her idea of what a man should call his wife when speaking of her to others. She says that "the average man doesn't know what to call his wife when he refers to her in company." The correspondent of the Sun lays down this rule: When Mr. Jones speaks of his wife to the servants he should say "Mrs. Jones," but the "stately habit" should go no further. When speaking to a friend or a stranger, he should drop the home names of "mother," "better half," "my boss," "the princess," and any other fond or familiar name and call her by her own name. If it is Emma, call her Emma; if it is Edith, call her Edith; call her that. Don't do like some people do in Texas, who instinctively if graphically call their wives "cook."

The Ohio State Journal, an authority on matters domestic, enters some exceptions to the rule laid down by the Sunpaper's correspondent, saying: "No, if it is a close friend one is talking to, one who knows the family well, it is all right to refer to the wife by her

Christian name." But to a stranger, thinks our contemporary, or in mixed company it is a "touch of disrespect" to call a wife by the familiar home name. Calling her Mrs. Jones or Mrs. Smith admits of few exceptions, for "there is a tendency to forget the dignity that belongs to the matrimonial relation."

BE AT THE CITY HALL TO-NIGHT.

The most vital question in years affecting the progress and welfare of Richmond and its people is to be decided at the City Hall to-night. Twenty-four men are called upon to say whether Richmond is to make a great stride forward or is to remain shackled with waste of the city's money, delay and irresponsible control. The shrewd, tricky men who are trying to block this plan for a better government of Richmond say that city government is none of the people's business and that the people haven't sense enough to govern themselves. That indictment includes you. Is your government any of your business? Do you care whether your money is extravagantly spent and wasted? Do you think the city is entitled to a full day's work for a full day's pay? Are you just a sheep in a driven flock, or are you a citizen who can think and discriminate between good and evil? The best answer you can make is by coming to the City Hall to-night. Pack the Council chamber, be there early and show to the Aldermen that the people are behind this plan.

The Farmville Herald says:

"There is a young married man who works in Farmville, but whose home is in the country, who rises early each morning and makes a cheerful fire in the room of his mother-in-law, an inmate of his home. Would you ask for better evidence of his loyalty and love?"

Very fine, but there are many young married men in Richmond who sit all night just to be able to be the first one to kiss their mothers-in-law in the morning.

Woodrow Wilson's home paper, the Staunton Daily Leader, stands right by him in the fight the New York Sun is making upon him. Hear the Leader:

"Let us hope that the standing of the Sun will enable Mr. Wilson's friends to say as was said of Mr. Cleveland: 'We love him for the enemies he has made.' . . . If the Sun, which is generally regarded as the champion of 'high finance,' whether it is right or wrong, can find nothing more serious to attack in Governor Wilson than that he applied to be pensioned as a faithful teacher of twenty-five years' service, then Staunton's candidate is pretty safe."

Dr. Wilson certainly has the undivided support and endorsement of the folks in his native town.

At the recent meeting of the Albemarle Presbytery in North Carolina one of the principal speakers was the Rev. Dr. Clay Lilly, who delivered, according to the correspondent of the Charlotte Chronicle, a "masterly" address upon "Men and Money." The correspondent says further:

"It is indeed a luxury to hear grand and glorious and ennobling truths; it is an added luxury to hear them preached in majestic and imperial and majestic robes of highest and finest intellectual furniture of expression. And this is what we heard in that deep, profound and scholarly production—the sumptuous fruitage of the finest mental culture and erudition."

The North Carolinians always know a good man when they see him.

Man.

To the Editor of The Times-Dispatch: Sir—Man has sent a wireless message going four thousand miles. Oh, man, in these days of your wonderful inventions and quest to solve almost every manner of thing! Why not bend every energy to solve man himself? Let your chief endeavor at something not yet attained—to accomplish this one thing—the solving of mankind.

There must be some rule that could be discovered by which the babe of to-day, who will become the man of tomorrow—some infallible rule—that a man should become everything that God intended him to be, mental and industrial. The one thing essential to this is to cause man to become a lover of man.

Fundamentally, a man should "love his neighbor as himself." He should "do unto others as he would have them do unto him." But he will never do this until every atom of selfishness and every body is extracted. This can be done only to a certain extent with the aid. Then the only alternative would be to be with the infant in his mother's arms. Now for the discovery of that infallible rule that governs by which every particle of selfishness in man at a time could be extracted from his body until not an atom of it remained.

As in beginning, why should there not be "demonstrators" as to the proper rearing of the child, as well as to the raising of corn or potatoes? Will the State help? And when I say State I mean the nation as well.

Some might say this would be so-called "demonstrations."

Abe Martin

WHAT CONGRESS WILL BE INTERESTED IN AT THIS SESSION.

By John T. McCutcheon.

[Copyright, 1911, By John T. McCutcheon.]

"We have been appointed a delegation to see you, Mr. Congressman, and urge your active support of certain important legislation at this session of Congress."

"We hope you will exert yourself toward the passage of this much needed reform, for its effect upon the country will be beneficial beyond belief."

"The cost of living will go down and the people will obtain relief from conditions that are becoming intolerable."

"You now have a chance to show constructive statesmanship and should not allow the petty considerations of politics to divert you from the performance of a great piece of unselfish patriotic duty."

"The people will honor you for it, though the bosses and politicians may not. Will you go into this session to play politics at the expense of a waiting country, or will you take the stand of a true statesman?"

"Besides, I think your party will strengthen itself for the great battle of 1912."

"The Congressman—Ain't do you? How you do, Trestle!"

chu dynasty; also that he was in sympathy with the movement.

By the death of Lord Dunsandle without issue, the Irish Barons of Dunsandle and Clan Conal have become extinct, as well as a representative of the ancient Irish house of Dunsandle, or O'Daly, a family which traces its descent from Nial Naogiallach (Nial of the Nine Hostages), nonarch of Ireland in the fourth century, who was also ancestor of the O'Neills, of Tyrone, and of the O'Donnells, of Tyrconnel. Delagh was tenth in descent from Nial; hence the name Dunsandle, as the descendants and followers are styled in old Irish writings, Siol na Dalagh, or the Clan of Dunsandle. Several of the O'Dalys were Kings of Meath.

With regard to the more modern members of the house, the Right Hon. Dennis Daly was for more than a generation member of Parliament for County Galway. In the Dublin Parliament, and Henry Gratian described him as "one of the best and brightest characters that Ireland ever produced." His son, a member of the present at Westminster for County Galway, was created a peer of Ireland, as Lord Dunsandle, and Clan Conal, by Queen Victoria, in the early years of her reign.

The Lord Dunsandle who has just died, fourth of his line, and who until his succession to the peerage was popular not only in his native county of Galway, but also in London, as "Jim Daly," one of the most four-in-hand whips of the Coaching Club, private secretary to Lord Beaconsfield, and Achates of the present Duke of Rutland, was a man whose name had become a household word in the aristocracy of the day. He was a bachelor until well towards sixty, when, straining one day over his estate in Galway, he encountered a very pretty peasant girl in tears. On stopping to inquire the cause of her weep, she informed him that she was on the eve of being married to a man whom she detested, and whom she was being forced to wed against her will, by her parents. It was a case of love at first sight. Lord Dunsandle impulsively exclaimed: "Will you take me for a husband instead?" The girl dried up her tears and accepted the offer. They were married immediately afterwards by a Catholic priest. But owing to legal informalities, their marriage was invalid in the eyes of the law, a fact which they did not ascertain until after the birth of a son, named William. The flaw was thereupon set right by another marriage, in due form, and it was after this that their daughter, the Hon. Anne Daly, was born. Her name alone figures as the issue of the second Lord Dunsandle's marriage with Mary Broderick, the Galway peasant girl.

William Daly could not, according to English or Irish law, be legitimized, and was therefore, debarré from the title, which passed, on the death of his father, to the latter's brother, the third Lord Dunsandle; and when he died unmarried, the peerage went to the son of his younger brother, Robert, namely, Jim Daly, who has just died, as fourth of his line. Lord Dunsandle, William Daly, however, inherited most of his father's property in Galway, including Dunsandle, which has been the home of the Dalys since the reign of James II. Also the beautiful old Castle of Thomastown, in County Tipperary.

(Copyright, 1911, by the Brentwood Company.)

La Marquise de Fontenoy

SINCE cable advices from China assert that there is a very strong movement in all parts of the empire in favor of the election to the throne of Sheng Kung Lin-Ji, the seventy-sixth in unbroken descent in the male line from Confucius, and the latter's genial heir, it may be timely to give some description of this premier among the dukes of the world. For "Sheng" means "Holy" and "Kung" means "Duke," and "Lin" is his name, and for the past twenty-four centuries the head of the Confucius family has always borne the title of "Holy Duke," preceding his name. Lin-Ji has the immense advantage in the eyes of his fellow-countrymen of being a Chinaman of the purest blood, and of the most revered ancestry, in a land where respect for ancestry is carried to the extent of actual worship; and as such, as well as in his capacity as heir of the good will of the Chinese people, the sixteenth-century-old Manchou Emperor Tzu-Yi, who, like his ancestor, the widowed Empress, and his various uncles, aunts and cousins forming the members of the reigning family, are in every sense of the word, an alien dynasty.

Should the holy duke become Emperor, the capital of the empire will be undoubtedly transferred to the province of Shan-Tung, where he makes his home, at Ky-Fu; a city which includes his superlative palace, and the tomb of his ancestor Confucius, who flourished about five centuries before the birth of Christ.

The holy duke is a six-foot tall, heavy-faced, Chinaman, fifty years of age, of somewhat massive build, with a rather majestic presence, and a good-natured face, the mouth inclined to a slight smile, and in keeping with shrewd, keen eyes. Though regarded by the Chinese as a foreigner, he is a native of the province of Shan-Tung, and is probably ninety-fifths of his 400,000,000 fellow-countrymen. He is a very jovial giant, and if popular rumor in his home province is received, who has been believed, he is extremely fond of the good things of life. He has paid many visits to Peking, where he has always been received with the most imposing honors, and does not disdain to travel by rail. In fact, he is quite progressive, fully alive to the advantages of reform, and quite keen about the matter as the late Li Hung-Chang. As an illustration thereof, he may mention that he granted permission for the Tientsin-Peking railway line to traverse his estates. He has also made use of his hereditary office of Inspector-General of Education, in an empire where the preference to high office has been wholly dependent upon learning, to further the innovation of foreign ideas. In fact, he has expressed himself as perfectly willing to abolish the ancient law requiring an altar to Confucius in every school and college throughout the empire, and the daily observance to that altar by every member of the faculty and student body, an obligation which, since graduation from these schools, learning was indispensable to government service, had the effect of excluding from the latter both Christians and Moslems. True, some of the government officials of China do profess Christianity; but they have become converts since their appointment.

Prince Chun, the ex-regent, was keenly alive to the strong hold of the holy duke upon the affection and regard of his countrymen, and in the hope of strengthening the foundations of the throne of his son, endeavored to bring this marriage to a conclusion by selecting a princess from among the monarch's consorts have been chosen ever since the Manchou invaders obtained the mastery of China. He hoped by this means to reconcile the bulk of the Chinese people to his house, and to obliterate, at any rate in a measure, the profound antagonism which exists between the Chinese and the Manchus.

The duke, however, held back, and could not brook the project, which naturally made to the belief that he was aware, even at the time that the proposal was mooted, that a movement was afoot, with the object of emancipating China from the Man-